

(b) REMARKS

This paper supplements the Response filed June 30, 2006. The claims are 24 and 26 with claim 24 being independent. Reconsideration of the claims is requested in view of the following arguments and the enclosed Rule 132 Declaration.

On page 4 of the Response filed June 30, 2006, it was argued as follows:

“With regard to the Examiner’s stated concerns, the graph presented in the last Response was not the transmittance of the charge transporting compound of Suzuki’s Example 1, but, instead, was the transmittance of a charge transport layer comprising the charge transporting compound of Suzuki Example 1 and a binder and the layer being prepared according to Example 1 of the present specification. Thus, the charge transport layer actually tested included 8 parts of a charge transporting compound (a) of Suzuki Example 1, 10 parts of bisphenol-Z polycarbonate binder and had a thickness of 23 μm . The charge transport layer of Suzuki Example 1 comprises 8 parts of a charge transporting compound (a), 10 parts of a bisphenol-Z type polycarbonate binder and had a thickness of 20 μm . See paragraphs ([0117]-[0119]). Therefore, the graphed data is for a charge transport layer which is substantially identical to that of Suzuki Example 1. A Rule 132 Declaration including this comparative test data will be filed shortly to complete the record.”

Applicants wish to correct the record with regard to the charge transport layer prepared, tested and graphed in the Figure presented in the Response filed February 9, 2006 and discussed in the above paragraph.

The charge transport layer whose transmittance was graphed was not that of Suzuki Example 1, but that of Suzuki Example 4. This is reflected in paragraph 6 of the enclosed executed Declaration of Yuka Nakajima.

Accordingly, in the above-reproduced paragraph of the February 9, 2006 Response, references to Suzuki Example 1 should have been to Suzuki Example 4. This change does not impact the arguments made against the art rejection based on the test results. The error is regretted and was inadvertent. In any event, the executed Rule 132 Declaration should be relied upon as the underlying factual basis for the results reported regarding the graph of the transmittance of the charge transport layer (CT-1).

The claims should be allowed and the case passed to issue.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter Saxon
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 24947

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
MY587788v1_